

Application No. 09/942,488
Reply to Final Office Action dated October 17, 2003

Page 5 of 7

Remarks/Discussion of Issues

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action mailed October 17, 2003. The Office Action notes that claims 1-9 are pending and rejects claims 1-9. As explained below, all of the pending claims are patentable.

Specification

The Office Action objects to the disclosure because the specification lacks section headings. Applicants respectfully decline to add headings to the specification as they are not required pursuant to MPEP §608.01(a).

35 U.S.C. §102(b) REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-3 and 7-9

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Do et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,998,918). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites a color picture screen provided with a blue phosphor layer comprising a mixture of particles of a first phosphor having a light emission in the range from 430 to 490 nm and particles of a second phosphor having a light emission in the range from 380 to 450 nm.

As stated in the Office Action, Do does not teach a phosphor layer comprising a mixture of particles and of first phosphor and second phosphor, a feature which is recited in claim 1. Therefore, Do does not teach nor suggest the features of claim 1, and does not teach nor suggest the features of claims 2, 3 and 7-9 which are dependent on claim 1.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejections of claims 1-3 and 7-9 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) REJECTION OF CLAIM 4

The Office Action rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Do in view of Hagiwara (JP 2-120389) and Fu et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,010,644). Claim 4 includes all the features of claim 1. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As provided above, Applicants have shown that Do does not teach the features of claim 1. Furthermore, as stated in the Office Action, claim 4 differs from Do is that Do does not disclose the second phosphor chosen from the group consisting of

236843

Application No. 09/942,488
Reply to Final Office Action dated October 17, 2003

Page 6 of 7

$\text{Sr}_2\text{P}_2\text{O}_7\text{:Eu}$. Therefore, Do does not teach nor render obvious the features of claim 4. Furthermore, Hagiwara does not teach nor render obvious the features of claim 1 and therefore does not teach nor render obvious the features of claim 4. Likewise, Fu does not teach nor render obvious the features of claim 1 and therefore does not teach nor render obvious the features of claim 4. Therefore, any permissible combination of Do and Hagiwara and Fu does not teach nor render obvious the features of claim 1, and therefore does not teach nor render obvious the features of claim 4.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 4 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) REJECTION OF CLAIMS 5 and 6

The Office Action rejects claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Do in view of the Hitachi patent (JP 2-135276). Claim 5 has been canceled. Claim 6 incorporates the features of claim 1. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As provided above, Applicants have shown that Do does not teach the features of claim 1. Therefore, Do does not teach nor render obvious the features of claim 6. Furthermore, the Hitachi patent does not teach nor render obvious the features of claim 1, and therefore does not teach nor render obvious the features of claim 6. Any permissible combination of Do and the Hitachi patent does not teach the features of claim 1, and therefore does not teach nor render obvious the features of claim 6.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 5 and 6 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Eric Bram at (914) 333-9635 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.


236843

Application No. 09/942,488
Reply to Final Office Action dated October 17, 2003

Page 7 of 7

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the United States Patent and Trademark Office, or if any additional fees are required, kindly charge these fees to Deposit Account No. 20-0782.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1/16/04

Lina Genovesi
Reg. No. 35,154
(732) 530-9404

Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
Attorneys at Law
595 Shrewsbury Avenue
Suite 100
Shrewsbury, NJ 07702

236843